

## Complete Summary

---

### GUIDELINE TITLE

The Society of Thoracic Surgeons practice guideline series: transmyocardial laser revascularization.

### BIBLIOGRAPHIC SOURCE(S)

Bridges CR, Horvath KA, Nugent WC, Shahian DM, Haan CK, Shemin RJ, Allen KB, Edwards FH. The Society of Thoracic Surgeons practice guideline series: transmyocardial laser revascularization. Ann Thorac Surg 2004 Apr; 77(4): 1494-502. [PubMed](#)

### GUIDELINE STATUS

This is the current release of the guideline.

## COMPLETE SUMMARY CONTENT

SCOPE  
 METHODOLOGY - including Rating Scheme and Cost Analysis  
 RECOMMENDATIONS  
 EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS  
 BENEFITS/HARMS OF IMPLEMENTING THE GUIDELINE RECOMMENDATIONS  
 QUALIFYING STATEMENTS  
 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GUIDELINE  
 INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE (IOM) NATIONAL HEALTHCARE QUALITY REPORT  
 CATEGORIES  
 IDENTIFYING INFORMATION AND AVAILABILITY  
 DISCLAIMER

## SCOPE

### DISEASE/CONDITION(S)

Chronic, severe angina

### GUIDELINE CATEGORY

Treatment

### CLINICAL SPECIALTY

Cardiology  
 Thoracic Surgery

## INTENDED USERS

Physicians

## GUIDELINE OBJECTIVE(S)

- To assist physicians and other health care providers in clinical decision-making by describing a range of generally acceptable approaches for the diagnosis, management, or prevention of specific diseases or conditions
- To present a clinical guideline with specific recommendations for the selection of patients for Transmyocardial Laser Revascularization (TMR)

## TARGET POPULATION

- Patients whose coronary anatomy precludes complete revascularization by either coronary artery bypass graft (CABG) or percutaneous catheter intervention (PCI)
- Patients in whom complete revascularization may be achieved with CABG but for whom the risk/benefit ratio of CABG is prohibitive

## INTERVENTIONS AND PRACTICES CONSIDERED

Transmyocardial laser revascularization (TLR):

- as sole therapy
- as an adjunct to coronary artery bypass graft (CABG)

## MAJOR OUTCOMES CONSIDERED

- Symptoms (e.g., angina)
- Function (e.g., exercise capacity)
- Survival
- Mortality
- Morbidity

## METHODOLOGY

### METHODS USED TO COLLECT/SELECT EVIDENCE

Hand-searches of Published Literature (Primary Sources)  
Hand-searches of Published Literature (Secondary Sources)  
Searches of Electronic Databases  
Searches of Unpublished Data

### DESCRIPTION OF METHODS USED TO COLLECT/SELECT THE EVIDENCE

Reviewed articles were obtained through a search of the MedLine database (1966-present), the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI), PubMed database (using keywords including "TMR," "laser," "revascularization," "transmyocardial," "TMLR," "PMR," and "DMR" as well as subject headings to

which these terms were mapped and logical combinations of these sets). Using the same databases, searches were performed by author for investigators active in the field. Additional references were obtained through direct communication with investigators. Selected manuscripts cited in the references were also reviewed.

#### NUMBER OF SOURCE DOCUMENTS

Not stated

#### METHODS USED TO ASSESS THE QUALITY AND STRENGTH OF THE EVIDENCE

Weighting According to a Rating Scheme (Scheme Given)

#### RATING SCHEME FOR THE STRENGTH OF THE EVIDENCE

Level of Evidence

Level A: Data derived from multiple randomized clinical trials

Level B: Data derived from a single randomized trial or from several nonrandomized trials

Level C: Consensus expert opinion

#### METHODS USED TO ANALYZE THE EVIDENCE

Systematic Review with Evidence Tables

#### DESCRIPTION OF THE METHODS USED TO ANALYZE THE EVIDENCE

Not stated

#### METHODS USED TO FORMULATE THE RECOMMENDATIONS

Expert Consensus

#### DESCRIPTION OF METHODS USED TO FORMULATE THE RECOMMENDATIONS

Not stated

#### RATING SCHEME FOR THE STRENGTH OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS

Classification of Recommendations

Class I: Conditions for which there is evidence and/or general agreement that a given procedure or treatment is useful and effective

Class II: Conditions for which there is conflicting evidence and/or a divergence of opinion about the usefulness/efficacy of a procedure or treatment

II.a.: Weight of evidence/opinion is in favor of usefulness/efficacy

II.b.: Usefulness/efficacy is less well established by evidence or opinion

Class III: Conditions for which there is evidence and/or general agreement that the procedure/treatment is not useful and in some cases may be harmful

## COST ANALYSIS

A formal cost analysis was not performed and published cost analyses were not reviewed.

## METHOD OF GUIDELINE VALIDATION

Peer Review

## DESCRIPTION OF METHOD OF GUIDELINE VALIDATION

Not stated

# RECOMMENDATIONS

## MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

The levels of evidence (A-C) and classification of recommendations (I-III) are defined at the end of the "Major Recommendations" field.

### Recommendations for Transmyocardial Laser Revascularization (TMR) as Sole Therapy

#### Class I

1. Patients with an ejection fraction greater than 30% and Canadian Cardiovascular Class III or IV angina that is refractory to maximal medical therapy. These patients should have reversible ischemia of the left ventricular free wall and coronary artery disease corresponding to the region of myocardial ischemia. In all regions of the myocardium, the coronary disease must not be amenable to coronary artery bypass graft (CABG) or percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty (PTCA), either due to a) severe diffuse disease, b) lack of suitable targets for complete revascularization, c) lack of suitable conduits for complete revascularization. (Level of Evidence: A)

#### Class IIB

1. Patients who otherwise have Class I indications for TMR but who have either

- a. Ejection fraction less than 30 percent with or without insertion of an intraaortic balloon pump. (Level of Evidence: C)
- b. Unstable angina/acute ischemia necessitating intravenous antianginal therapy. (Level of Evidence: B)
- c. Patients with Class II angina. (Level of Evidence: C)

### Class III

1. Patients without angina or with Class I angina. (Level of Evidence: C)
2. Acute evolving myocardial infarction or recent transmural or nontransmural myocardial infarction. (Level of Evidence: C)
3. Cardiogenic shock defined as a systolic blood pressure less than 80 mm/Hg or a cardiac index of less than 1.8L/min/m<sup>2</sup>. (Level of Evidence: C)
4. Uncontrolled ventricular or supraventricular tachyarrhythmias. (Level of Evidence: C)
5. Decompensated congestive heart failure. (Level of Evidence: C)

### Recommendations for TMR as an Adjunct to CABG

#### Class IIa

1. Patients with angina (Class I - IV) in whom CABG is the standard of care who also have at least one accessible and viable ischemic region with demonstrable coronary artery disease which cannot be bypassed, either due to a) severe diffuse disease, b) lack of suitable targets for complete revascularization, or c) lack of suitable conduits for complete revascularization. (Level of Evidence: B)

#### Class IIb

1. Patients without angina in whom CABG is the standard of care who also have at least one accessible and viable ischemic region with demonstrable coronary artery disease which cannot be bypassed, either due to a) severe diffuse disease, b) lack of suitable targets for complete revascularization, or c) lack of suitable conduits for complete revascularization. (Level of Evidence: C)

### Class III

Patients in whom CABG is not the standard of care (Level of Evidence: C)

### Definitions

Level of Evidence

Level A: Data derived from multiple randomized clinical trials

Level B: Data derived from a single randomized trial or from several nonrandomized trials

Level C: Consensus expert opinion

## Classification of Recommendations

Class I: Conditions for which there is evidence and/or general agreement that a given procedure or treatment is useful and effective

Class II: Conditions for which there is conflicting evidence and/or a divergence of opinion about the usefulness/efficacy of a procedure or treatment

II.a.: Weight of evidence/opinion is in favor of usefulness/efficacy

II.b.: Usefulness/efficacy is less well established by evidence or opinion

Class III: Conditions for which there is evidence and/or general agreement that the procedure/treatment is not useful and in some cases may be harmful

## CLINICAL ALGORITHM(S)

None provided

## EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS

### TYPE OF EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS

The type of evidence supporting the recommendations is specifically stated for each recommendation (see 'Major Recommendations' field).

## BENEFITS/HARMS OF IMPLEMENTING THE GUIDELINE RECOMMENDATIONS

### POTENTIAL BENEFITS

- Assist physicians and other health care providers in clinical decision-making regarding selection of patients for Transmyocardial Laser Revascularization (TMR)
- Reduce angina symptoms
- Improve quality of life

### POTENTIAL HARMS

Morbidity and mortality

Subgroup Most Likely to Experience Harms

Patients at highest risk for morbidity and mortality following transmyocardial laser revascularization (TMR) include patients with unstable angina, global myocardial ischemia, and diminished left ventricular function.

## QUALIFYING STATEMENTS

### QUALIFYING STATEMENTS

These guidelines should not be considered inclusive of all proper methods of care or exclusive of other methods of care reasonably directed at obtaining the same results. Moreover, these guidelines are subject to change over time, without notice. The ultimate judgment regarding the care of a particular patient must be made by the physician in light of the individual circumstances presented by the patient.

## IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GUIDELINE

### DESCRIPTION OF IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

An implementation strategy was not provided.

## INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE (IOM) NATIONAL HEALTHCARE QUALITY REPORT CATEGORIES

### IOM CARE NEED

Getting Better

### IOM DOMAIN

Effectiveness

## IDENTIFYING INFORMATION AND AVAILABILITY

### BIBLIOGRAPHIC SOURCE(S)

Bridges CR, Horvath KA, Nugent WC, Shahian DM, Haan CK, Shemin RJ, Allen KB, Edwards FH. The Society of Thoracic Surgeons practice guideline series: transmyocardial laser revascularization. Ann Thorac Surg 2004 Apr; 77(4): 1494-502. [PubMed](#)

### ADAPTATION

Not applicable: The guideline was not adapted from another source.

### DATE RELEASED

2003

### GUIDELINE DEVELOPER(S)

Society of Thoracic Surgeons - Medical Specialty Society

#### SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING

Society of Thoracic Surgeons

#### GUIDELINE COMMITTEE

Workforce on Evidence-Based Medicine

#### COMPOSITION OF GROUP THAT AUTHORED THE GUIDELINE

Workforce Members: Charles R. Bridges, MD (TMR Taskforce Chair), ScD; Keith A. Horvath, MD; William C. Nugent, M.D; David M. Shahian, MD; Constance K. Haan, MD; Richard J. Shemin, MD; Keith B. Allen, MD; Fred H. Edwards, MD

#### FINANCIAL DISCLOSURES/CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Not stated

#### GUIDELINE STATUS

This is the current release of the guideline.

#### GUIDELINE AVAILABILITY

Electronic copies: Available from the [Society of Thoracic Surgeons Web site](#).

Print copies: Available from The Society of Thoracic Surgeons, 633 N. Saint Clair St., Suite 2320, Chicago, IL, USA 60611-3658

#### AVAILABILITY OF COMPANION DOCUMENTS

None available

#### PATIENT RESOURCES

None available

#### NGC STATUS

This NGC summary was completed by ECRI on March 30, 2005. The information was verified by the guideline developer on May 3, 2005.

#### COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

This NGC summary is based on the original guideline, which is subject to the guideline developer's copyright restrictions.



## DISCLAIMER

### NGC DISCLAIMER

The National Guideline Clearinghouse™ (NGC) does not develop, produce, approve, or endorse the guidelines represented on this site.

All guidelines summarized by NGC and hosted on our site are produced under the auspices of medical specialty societies, relevant professional associations, public or private organizations, other government agencies, health care organizations or plans, and similar entities.

Guidelines represented on the NGC Web site are submitted by guideline developers, and are screened solely to determine that they meet the NGC Inclusion Criteria which may be found at <http://www.guideline.gov/about/inclusion.aspx>.

NGC, AHRQ, and its contractor ECRI make no warranties concerning the content or clinical efficacy or effectiveness of the clinical practice guidelines and related materials represented on this site. Moreover, the views and opinions of developers or authors of guidelines represented on this site do not necessarily state or reflect those of NGC, AHRQ, or its contractor ECRI, and inclusion or hosting of guidelines in NGC may not be used for advertising or commercial endorsement purposes.

Readers with questions regarding guideline content are directed to contact the guideline developer.

© 1998-2006 National Guideline Clearinghouse

Date Modified: 9/25/2006

